

bully. I assume our reliance on unilateral sanctions when necessary may fit his definition of bully. I cannot possibly agree.

The third track of a comprehensive approach to this crucial problem is open discussion of, and early preparation for, military options. It has become increasingly clear over the past several years that diplomacy and sanctions alone are too weak to compel Iranian compliance with the international communities' demands. A frank discussion of military options and preparations give credibility to the rest of our strategy. No one should suppose these steps mean anything other than preparing the ground for the logical and necessary access to measures of last resort.

At the Bipartisan Policy Center, I participated in an exhaustive analysis of all of the means and consequences of a potential military action against Iran's nuclear weapons program. There were no war advocates among us. Nevertheless, if it is true that a nuclear weapons-capable Iran is unacceptable, as now four U.S. Presidents have publicly declared, including the current President, then our Nation and the international community as a whole must see with vivid clarity what measures remain should the first two tracks fail to achieve the objective.

The Iranian regime must be especially clear-eyed and nondelusional about those potential consequences should it not change its behavior. Indeed, to give the diplomatic and sanctions tracks the essential credibility they require, then a military option must be entirely believable if, as the President has repeatedly said, Iranian possession of nuclear arms capability is unacceptable.

I cannot conclude that Senator Hagel views the military option in this credible way. Indeed, he has maintained in recent years that "a military strike against Iran is not a viable, feasible, responsible option."

Many of us have examined Senator Hagel's on-the-record comments carefully and parsed each one to determine what his views on these important subjects actually are. In the meantime, he has hastened to apparently amend the record so that his advocates can point to more recent statements that seem to negate the earlier ones. But this is not a court of law, and we are not looking for admissible evidence. Rather, we are defining the basis for our own judgments on how the full pattern of words and behavior define the views and likely future behavior of the nominee.

In so doing, I have concluded that when Senator Hagel pays lip service now to the contention that "all options are on the table," it does not reveal his real, extinctive, and strong disinclination to consider military force if it becomes necessary. For me, that is very nearly a disqualifying position for any Secretary of Defense.

A related concern is what I believe to be Senator Hagel's views about the so-

called containment option. This is related to his nearly notorious views about nuclear proliferation in general. He has famously said "the genie of nuclear weapons is already out of the bottle, no matter what Iran does." I fear Senator Hagel holds the mistaken view that a nuclear-armed Iran is more palatable than the consequences of going to war to prevent it. That is a dangerously corrosive idea.

Indeed, my concern was heightened this morning when Senator Hagel, in testimony before the Armed Services Committee, referred twice to his support for containment. It was only when someone handed him a note, presumably reminding him the administration's formal position did not support containment, did he correct himself and say he didn't support it either.

So what are we to conclude relative to what he truly believes and where he actually stands on a number of issues vital to our national security? The supreme fallacy of the containment option as modified is that it severs the spine of all of our friends and allies who are justifiably appalled by the contemplation of real military action. They will eagerly lead toward a containment option should others fail. But we must all see clearly that, in fact, containment means toleration.

A nuclear weapons-capable Iran that we believe can be contained is one that we are, therefore, prepared to tolerate. This is an illusion and one that makes our task all that much harder. If others—especially Iran, but also including our allies and other coalition partners—come to believe that we would consider ever tolerating a nuclear Iran because it can somehow be contained, then none of our efforts to prevent it will work. This is why a nominee for Secretary of Defense who is less than firm on this key point is, in my opinion, a dangerous choice.

It has been said by Senator Hagel's supporters that whatever his personal views and past statements on these important issues, as Secretary he will toe the line; he will not be making these basic policies himself. In other words, those of us who find his policies objectionable are encouraged to support the nominee despite his views, not because of them.

I cannot bring myself to support a nominee based on the assumption that his own views will become irrelevant once he is under the policy yoke imposed by the White House.

Finally, the most worrisome consequence of confirming Senator Hagel to be Secretary of Defense is something on which the ayatollahs in Tehran and I can agree: The confirmation will tell the Iranian regime that their fear of U.S. military action in Iran is now unjustified. They can rest more comfortably that their pursuit of nuclear weapons is less likely to provoke the military option that, until recently, may have seemed more credible.

The Iranians will, therefore, feel less constrained in pursuing their dan-

gerous nuclear ambitions. That, more than any other reason, is why I am voting no on the Hagel nomination.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

#### TRIBUTE TO ADELE HALL

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, all of us in our lives from time to time hear of the passing, the death of someone we know. Sometimes it is family, often friends, or perhaps someone we are only vaguely acquainted with. This past week, we learned of the death of a Kansas City resident, Adele Hall. Her passing so personally saddens me because Adele Hall was a person with such optimism and so engaged in improving the lives of others.

Kansas City, in fact, lost one of their greatest champions when Adele Hall passed away. Adele was a longtime resident of Kansas City and was well known and well loved, highly respected for her acts of service and kindness to others. When she wasn't serving on a board of a nonprofit, she was raising funds for a worthy cause or volunteering with children. My guess is that she probably was doing all of those things at once.

Adele, I am sure, had the financial resources to live a life different than in service to others, but she chose to commit her life to making sure others had the chance for the success that she had.

She grew up in Lincoln, NE, and she was—I read today, in her honor, that she was an avid Nebraska fan.

In Nebraska, Adele learned the importance of giving back by watching her own parents volunteer, especially with the Salvation Army. As a young woman, she developed a love for children and later became involved in so many organizations that cared for their health and education and well-being. Adele never lost faith in the potential of a young person's life. One of her greatest passions was working with children at Children's Mercy Hospital. Adele served as chairman of the board there and together with the help of professional golfer Tom Watson, she established the Children's Mercy Golf Classic, which over a quarter of a century has raised more than \$10 million for Children's Mercy. Adele also used her expertise to bless children nationwide through her work as a member of National Commission for Children.

Those boards and that service was important to her, but it was always the personal touch, not just serving on a board and making decisions about a hospital or the children it cared for, but personally caring for the children in the hospital.

Her actions were guided by a belief in the value of each and every individual. She lived out that Biblical teaching "love your neighbor as yourself," through her service as the first woman president of the United Way of Greater

Kansas City. Adele always looked for the best in others and worked to bring people together. Her efforts were always at bringing a diverse group of opinionated people together in a way that would solve a problem.

She was an inspiration for other women, and she cofounded the Central Exchange and the Women's Public Service Network in Kansas City to help women embrace their careers and develop skills to pursue leadership positions.

She also served as the board chairman of the Greater Kansas City Community Foundation and actively participated on boards of the Pembroke Hill School, Salvation Army, Starlight Theatre, and the American Red Cross. To recognize Adele's years of service to the Kansas City community, she was named Kansas Citian of the Year—the first woman to hold that title.

In an era when we sometimes wonder what difference one person can make, Adele proved that one person is all it takes to touch the lives of others. I have always believed that what we do here in the Nation's Capital is important, but the reality is we change the world one soul, one person at a time. And Adele Hall lived that life and made that difference each and every day.

By investing her time, talents, and treasure in the community where she lived, she made a difference one life at a time. Her involvement in her community and her selflessness serve as an inspiration, a role model to every American.

Adele was loved. I never met a person who did not love and respect Adele Hall, and everyone who knew her loved and admired her and saw her as a special person. No doubt, especially she was loved by her family. She was known by a saying, "Leave the dishes in the sink and play with your kids," and her family benefited from that kind of philosophy, her wholehearted dedication to each of them.

She was married to her husband Don for nearly 60 years and was a devoted wife and a loving mother to their three children. I ask the Senate to join me today in extending our heartfelt sympathies to her husband Don, her sons Donald and David, her daughter Margaret, and her nine grandchildren. She was loved by them dearly, and she will be greatly missed.

Adele once said that voluntarism is a "belief in love," and her love will be forever remembered by the lives she changed for the better. If your value in life is whether you made a difference while you were here, Adele Hall lived that life and contributed so greatly to others. God bless her for her life and let her be a role model for all of us.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, this past weekend I had the opportunity to

attend a conference of the Wyoming American Legion. Many of the veterans I spoke with remain very concerned about their health care and specifically about the impacts of the Obama health care law on their lives and on their health.

The men and women whom I met with are very worried they may lose their health coverage. Why? Because of the law. They wonder what happened to the insurance premium cuts they were supposed to have gotten by now—not in the future but promised to have gotten by now.

These men and women have not gotten many of the benefits they were told to expect, but what they are getting are all the costs. That is why the people I talk with every weekend at home in Wyoming understand what the Democrats in Washington still will not admit: that the President's health care law remains unworkable, unpopular, and absolutely unaffordable.

Remember when the President promised that if you like your health care plan, you can keep it? Well, all of America now knows it was an empty promise, just as when President Obama promised health insurance premiums would go down. Over and over, the President said that his law would lower premiums by \$2,500 a family by the end of his first term in office. The President has not talked much about that lately. I did not hear anything about it in his inaugural address, and I do not expect to hear very much about it in his State of the Union Address. It is because average premiums across the country for families have not gone down—not by the \$2,500 that the President promised, not by even \$1,000, not even by a cent. Instead, average family premiums have actually gone up by more than \$3,000 during the President's first term. That is a pretty big math error on the part of President Obama, and the American people, unfortunately, are the ones who have to pay for his mistake.

Because of his policies, health insurance is a lot less affordable for a lot of people and for a lot of small businesses. Now many small businesses are facing what is turning out to be an impossible decision. If they expand their business and cross the law's threshold of 50 employees, they will be subject to the employer insurance mandate. If they choose not to expand, then they are holding back potential growth and the opportunities that come with it. In this current economic environment, the last thing we should be doing is making it more difficult for businesses to expand and hire more people. But because of the President's health care law, that is exactly what is happening.

The Wall Street Journal ran a piece recently about a small business owner named Carl Schanstra. He owns a parts assembly factory near Chicago, IL. It is called Automation Systems LLC.

Sales have been growing, and the business is doing well, but he has a problem because he already employs

close to 50 people. That means he is getting dangerously close to the law's threshold and the new health care burdens it would place on him, including all the expenses.

As he puts it, he says: "I'll be hammered for having more people at work." The cost of providing insurance would be enormous. The cost of paying the tax penalty for not offering insurance would also be enormous.

That is not a good option for a small business such as Automation Systems—a small business that wants to expand, a small business that has an opportunity to expand and hire more people. So he has to look for ways to stay under the law's limits.

He plans to raise prices to give himself a buffer against the new health care law, and he may even have to break his company into two different companies so they can stay below the limits. He may avoid hiring more people or buy more machinery to replace some of the workers.

A rational and responsible business owner wants to make decisions based on what is best for the business and its employees. Now we have business owners having to make these decisions based on the crushing regulatory burden imposed upon them by Washington.

Carl is not the only business owner who is having to face tough choices because of the health care law. According to a new survey Gallup put out last week, more than half of small business owners say health care costs and taxes are hurting them a lot. Those two things—health care costs and taxes—led the list of their concerns by a wide margin. When Gallup looked specifically at businesses that were not hiring, 61 percent of them—nearly two out of every three—said it was because of the potential cost of health care.

Washington should be creating policies that encourage businesses to hire and making hiring easier. Again, that is what our economy needs to recover. Instead, this administration has been piling up more costs, more regulations, and more ways to discourage hiring.

That is one person's story. But just down the road from where Carl is trying to do what is best for his business and his workers, the city of Chicago itself is facing some of the same concerns. Chicago has decided it cannot afford to pay the health care costs of its retired city workers. So what is the whole city of Chicago going to do? Well, it is looking at dumping those former workers into the ObamaCare exchange. It would save the city a lot of money, but the taxpayers of Illinois and every other State would have to make up the tab because the city is trying to skip out on paying their own bill.

Federal subsidies for Chicago retirees would be \$44 million in 2014, and that amount would only grow over time. Of course, we know the mayor of Chicago is Rahm Emanuel. He was one of the main figures in the room where ObamaCare was being written, and we